

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/725,756	Applicant(s) MAKINO, HIDEYO	
	Examiner Hai C. Pham	Art Unit 2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C. Pham. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Zachary Stern, Applicant's Representative. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 11 February 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 2, 6, 22 and 26.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nakajima (JP 9-236763), Yamauchi (U.S. 6,133,566), Naoe (U.S. 5,758,950), Iwasa (U.S. 6,144,685).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative proposes to amend the apparatus claims to include details pertinent to the adjusting means for adjusting the tilting angle of the light emitting elements of the laser diode array within the required range, as well as to add a new method claim regarding the adjustment of the tilting angle, to overcome the prior art of record. The examiner indicates that an update search would be needed once the response to the previous Office action is received..